M2013
Restricted
Firefly House, 1st tape, third series (7 tapes)
Sunday, April 18, 1971

Mr. Nyland: The attendance at these meetings is entirely left to you. I tried to explain last night what the meaning is of these kind of meetings: to open an opportunity to talk about Work, particularly from the standpoint of those people who have had experience in having to explain Work to others. Now that can be extended, not only including nuclei and people who are answering tapes, but also in small groups or sometimes I would include that you talk to yourself in trying to become clear about the meaning of Work and that the concepts may not be entirely the way you have understood them before, and that because of experience you gradually start to have a different kind of a viewpoint. It is your conscience that will have to decide if these kind of meetings are for you, and I am not going to say "yes" or "no." It is left to you, but you must understand that the level of the meeting will be determined by the people who come and contribute.

You probably remember that at the second meeting of the so-called 'Firefly' tapes I tried at that time to ask questions. From my standpoint it was a complete failure. And since that time, for the rest of the Firefly tapes, I simply continued to talk, to try to elucidate about certain subjects in a certain sequence. And we made that, at that time, as a series consisting of fourteen meetings; two sections: one of seven separated by a free Tuesday, and then another series of seven. It was my plan, at that time, to make a series of seven, three times. So that we would have, what you might call, a 'third' one which could

be considered a résumé of previous material as we had then talked about. But, a material then that could have been used by the different people if they wished, and that then the substance of the third, let's call it 'series'—the third seven—would really mean that we talked about experiences of oneself. A few years have gone by. And I have waited. And I have now decided that this is the beginning of the third part of the so-called 'Firefly House' tapes.

Again, I don't want the impression that it is closed to those who honestly need it. But I do believe that those who attended the first part of Firefly meetings, several of them definitely were not entitled to come. The choice is extremely difficult to make. And whichever way I would choose, I will be criticized—and I would be, and I have been—of people who thought they belonged, and in their ignorance did not know what was the meaning, the meaning of such meetings. For that reason I don't want to decide it now. I leave it.

I would like to have seven meetings of this kind. If possible, on this kind of a...in that...in this kind of a time, like Sunday morning, in between physical work. Who can attend? It depends on who is here. And that gradually it may become known that some who think they want to belong, they should have been here, perhaps they will be entitled to listen to this tape, and subsequent tapes. But, again I want to leave that entirely to the conscience of people who want to come. Because, if I don't do that, I am liable to lower the level.

Naturally, the meeting, as such, and the substance of what we want to talk about, is based on the experiences of the last three, four years. Particularly for those people who then were in a position to answer tapes, to answer questions. And having listened to the tapes, and many times try to answer it either by word of mouth or sometimes, like for other cities, by means of tapes, trying to recall, time and time again, the questions as they had

been asked and perhaps had been answered. And that that has spread out to give opportunities to others to do the same thing and get the same kind of experience, because I believe it is necessary that in order to find out if you know about Work, that you have to find it out by means of having to explain it and remain simple.

Now, I have definitely the impression that we get so often confused in so much that is extraneous and does not belong to Work at all and simply clutters up concepts. When we talk about the simplicity of concepts, we have to stick to that. And if we introduce all kind of philosophies and, very often, personal opinions, I think we are led astray. Ourselves, we are astray because we don't know it, and at the same time in doing it, your influence on other people of course is very, very marked. Because, to some extent, you put yourself up as a little authority. And for those who honestly want to know, they have to have guidance. And although I have mentioned many times the necessity of coming to conclusions together like an experimental group doing research to settle on certain ways of how to define this and that and not to get out of it, to establish a language which Gurdjieff would call "exact" as a necessity of conveying the principles of Work on oneself, we have gone away from that every once in a while, and I don't think it is right.

I would like to try to correct it with this series. I would like to talk about what is your question about the questions. What is it that you want to explain sometimes and in what way you explain it and, for your own conscience, where you know you got stuck and after a little while you could not find a thread anymore with which you have started. And you keep on adding and adding a few words, more and more adding to the confusion of the person who listens to it. And then finally ending up by some conclusions which have nothing to do anymore with what you originally planned to say. And many times that you even forget what was the original question. And then you end up with something that may be of a certain value to you, but not at all to someone who wants to know just a simple

answer.

I would like to try to avoid it. It is not that you all have to talk in the same kind of words, because there must always be, in any explanation, a certain characteristic which belongs to you. And it is exemplified in the way you talk and the voice you have, and the emphasis you want to place on certain words. That is all your own, and it should remain that way. Gurdjieff used a language which became his language. That is, he called it a 'root' language. Also, very simple, quite exact and really to the point and not too many words trying to embellish it. Ouspensky was so far removed from that, because he added, all the time, theoretical knowledge of a certain kind, belonging to himself, which was quite right for him but it was not right to be used in the form of communication.

So, with this kind of explanation I would like you to keep remembering this, so that when we talk in subsequent meetings, that you come here with your own questions to be answered or for clarification and put them on the table so that all of us can say what we want, and not I the only one who explains to you. I would like to get away from that. I've said that many times. Because I know how difficult it is that when I'm here that you cater a little bit to my presence. You should try to get rid of that. You should try to be quite open as if I'm one of all of us, sitting here to talk about Work and about the possibility of a means of freeing oneself from the consequences of the organ Kundabuffer. We all are subject to that, and the way you want to talk, the way you want to explain things for yourself, never should be criticized by anyone of this group.

You come here, as it were, on an 'operating table.' You invite the knowledge that is available by a group of people who are serious about disease and psychological relationships and difficulties, in confusion to try to find a thread of what is really meant by life and the way it has to be lived on Earth and, to some extent, then, the description of the bondage which life in oneself finds itself with and wakes up to every once in a while, like in

the morning one wakes up to a world. That at times one does wake up to a psychological world of bondage and habits and all kind of clichés and sometimes a great deal of nonsense. And you want to find your way out of that particular labyrinth.

We need a thread, a thread of Ariadne, to be able to find a way out. Whichever way we go, we drop certain things to be recognized, that when we want to get back again or take the state where we started from with a simple 'ABC,' that we are not confused by all the letters of the alphabet which have been thrown away during the period that we try to work ourselves out of a labyrinth. There is an opening. We have come into this world, we will have to go out of it again. How will we get out of it without having to pay too much or without leaving at the exit a promissory note that we have to repay in our next reincarnation. That is the whole idea of Work, now. That's the idea of concepts. That's the idea of bringing to a group of this kind your questions.

If you have them, if you have concepts you want to talk about, let's begin. Yea.

Fred Goodall: Mr. Nyland, when I, when I hear a person ask a question and I all of a sudden clearly see what I could say to help clear something up for them, something happens between the time I start to talk and, well, from that point on, where I lose the clarity of what their question is and what I'm trying to say, and...

Mr. Nyland: The question is how to change it?

Fred: The question is how to hold on to that, that clarity. I try...

Mr. Nyland: Even if you start in the beginning and it is clear, it is not really clear, because your own words start to confuse your own clarity. For a thing to be clear is first to have it in your mind, surrounded by all kind of concepts which you call thoughts for yourself, and regardless of the different thoughts that you do have, when they affect you, in your mind, with the concept of clarity, regarding Work let's say, that then you are able to counteract the thoughts and associations in your mind and stick constantly to the clarity. As soon as

you start to talk to someone you become associated with the thought of the others and your own thoughts, and the clarity disappears because it is not sufficiently grown up to withstand the onslaught of your own mental process. The reason I've given many times is, as a person asks a question, you follow with your thoughts the logicality, or perhaps not even the clarity of such a question. You try to find out where the question comes from with the person you are listening to. You see their reasoning, you hear the way they use certain words. You give value to them as you listen. And as it gradually becomes clear to you what is the form of that question and what is really the essential quality of it—that is, as a question for an answer—all during that period, parallel to their talking, you introduce into your mind a mode of attack.

You have to be with them, and not be with your own thoughts. You have to eliminate, for the time being, your thoughts. You have to be open to what someone else is telling, and your thoughts need not interfere because you are in a receptive mood and not as yet in a giving mood. The difficulty is always, as soon as you hear what someone else wants to have an answer to, you already start to give, and you are just on the opposite side of the scale. You have to remain open all during the time that a person is asking. You have to allow them time, even, to formulate. You have to have a great deal of patience until you are convinced that you know what is the state of their mind, or perhaps the state of their feeling.

Perhaps it is necessary at such a time, that before you then answer, you start to realize the clarity of yourself and your aim. Even if you formulate it subvocally in your mind—"*that* I want to say"—and it is clear to you that that should be the end. You need not start with the end, you start with your own mind developing, at that time changing over from receiving into giving. Then you enter into their field with your world, and then constantly having in mind your aim, you will not lose the clarity of what you want to say,

but you can go on all kind of byways with them and go along with them, all the time having in mind, "I want to say something about Work, I want to indicate what for me is the clarity of Work which I believe is useful for that person."

You have to learn it, Fred. You just cannot assume that you know. Because the fact that you do lose, with the best of intention wanting to say something and help, you put the cart before the horse. You have nothing to draw. All you have is the wish that you want to help, but you have nothing of the material that they have furnished in the form of their question. Digest their question first. I call it 'parallelism:' to go together with them in formulating as they go along, you subvocally all the time having in mind your aim of Work. And then, the method that you will have to employ in the answer will be dependant on what they have asked. And starting then with where they left off—and, as I said several times, making them realize that they can trust you—then they will listen. Then you can carry them from one place to another.

I think, you see, that it is not clear in your mind what Work is. Because Work for such people...purposes has to be clarified mentally and it cannot be done by a feeling. I can have a wish, and I honestly will want to communicate because I care for such and such a person and I want to help, but when I use words that are a little bit dubious or can be interpreted in different ways and not really exact or not entirely based on something that you might call now the 'universal' acceptance of terminology for Work. And of course I confuse them and I become confused myself. You understand what I mean.

Listen much more to what a person says, and if you come to a conclusion you cannot help them, even if you wish, don't talk. Angels are fearful even in entering heaven.

But, what are concepts? Because this is still a state, this is a condition in which a person finds himself when he has to answer; it is a description, again, of the person who is under an obligation; but you are not talking, now, this is not a talk about the medicine.

The medicine is what you give as concepts. The medicine is an exactness of the description, for instance, of creation of 'I' and what is the meaning of 'I' if you want to describe properties of 'I,' or what you expect an 'I' to be. How will it function? Where will your 'I'—anyone else's 'I'—start? With what will it start? What is the quality in a little 'I'? Is it mental or is it also emotional? Is it a mixture? Is it subject to growth? Not only that one ought to know how to make it grow, but you have to illustrate first the function of what you hope it will be even if, for the time being, it has not the reality since it comes from a subjective world of your own and the creation of an Objective entity by means of material which is subjective, primarily, of course you have to go the road of fantasy and an imagination. Sometimes a hallucination, sometimes an aspect that for you is nothing else but inspirational. But you have to illustrate that, because you have to have a belief in God without describing Him and without having proof of His existence. But I say, "It is God for me" because He is the highest that I can conceive of either in my feeling or in my mind. And I work with that as a concept, and I simply call it 'God' as indicating it is the highest. But it does not mean that if there is something that could be higher, that I wouldn't change over and call *that* God for me. Otherwise I would get stuck in my own definition.

So, if I say this little 'I,' it represents at the present time something for me that can be a guide, I've got to endow it with a quality to guide me. And what is involved in that wish for that kind of a guidance, for myself the realization that I'm talking about something unnatural in my ordinary subjective life. The emphasis all the time must be on the trying to make and to bring into existence something that does not exist as a creation. We talk about creative art. We are not talking about descriptive or natural art. We are not talking about photography. We are not talking about something that you can already see and perceive. We are talking about an impossible thing that is there somewhere, in between the Earth and the Sun, and we would like it to have an ability. And for a long time it must

remain vague, but the vagueness, when I use it for myself, becomes apparent in very concrete statements of myself. Constantly being under the influence of the vagueness, I make reality of my own experience.

It's a tremendous difference when there is a possibility of taking part of God and putting it into my life, so that it is not dependant only on a prayerful attitude and hoping for the best and sitting and waiting until God comes down. When I create 'I,' I bring God down to me, within my means. And when it is within my means, it starts to belong to my kingdom, and I can make then, if I wish, almost anything of it, including the highest for me. And it becomes first as a symbol, representing something that is not real as yet, but by living in accordance with the rules of a symbol, I introduce elements of reality for myself and because of that influence, this little 'I' starts to become an entirely different kind of an entity.

But let's not forget that it always starts in a concept, either of God of some kind being brought down to Earth and then wanting to help you and having particular qualities that you have endowed it with so that then it can become a reality in the terminology of your own words and not just vague and remain vague and 'blue sky.' You bring 'blue sky' down to Earth when you talk about a mental concept that takes place in a certain section of your brain specially reserved for that purpose, and having nothing whatsoever to do with all the other mental functions of your brain. It is not just a part of the brain. It's an exceptional something of the brain that has a potentiality. All the rest of the brain and the departments that we talk about—formulations and the rest—they belong to Earth. They belong to my mind, as it is. They belong to my human body.

When I talk about something that is potential, and that is an entirely different kind of quality, when I endow a certain section that probably has not been used or perhaps was forgotten, or in some way or other got rusty, or in any event where there is machinery that

I could call a 'mental' machinery kind but does...did not use...has not been used anymore. And I don't know how to use it. I have to learn how to. When I enter into that kind of a little compartment, when I see it and there is dust and cobwebs and I say, "how sad that it has been there, neglected." For whatever reason—I don't care—I have the key, I open the door and I see that little compartment. And it is, "Let's make something of this. Let's see if we cannot make a little factory out of it that is worthwhile to be used for the purpose of obtaining Objective facts about myself." It has nothing to do with the rest of the factory and all the different labor that goes on. Let them do whatever it is; it's good for the functioning of my body.

But this time, when I open that little door to that compartment, I am in a mental atmosphere. Don't ever forget that. Because I deal in concepts. I deal in possibilities in Objective Faculty. I deal in something that has to have that kind of a substance and then, with that, in order to eliminate the coldness of it, I introduce the love of God in it. I am entitled to take something of that kind from God and say, "I make it my own, because I am God's child." It is that kind of inheritance that one has to realize all the time. What is it really that makes me the preposterous kind of a guy, thinking that I am entitled to certain things that God has set aside for all the forms of hierarchy somewhere, and I assume that I want to go up there and I want to live in accordance with the rules as much as I can understand them.

But, keep clear in your concepts, because it is you, as a human being walking on Earth with these kind of thoughts and these kind of feelings, and the contact which cannot be direct through this little compartment, because it is dusty, and stuffy, and it has not had windows open maybe for a long time, and maybe you have to make them. That what is your aliveness, *that* brings the contact with the Lord. Not your mind. But you have to have force, energy, contact—emotional; you have to have that wish. That wish constantly

has to be there—"unflagging," Gurdjieff calls it—to make sure that that is there in order for this little 'I' to start to operate because of your wish, because of your 'fantastic' wish, your wish for fantasy, your wish for imagination, of becoming an ideal man.

Your answers have to be much simpler. You have to acknowledge that certain things take place in the brain and that they are fed by your wish—in your feeling, in your emotional state—in that what you really and honestly wish for yourself as something that belongs to your life and to someone else's life, and is not self centered within your own little bits of feelings. You can leave that alone. That is Man Number One, Two and Three. Let it be whatever it is. It's O.K., but we talk about a man who has ideas about the possibility of growth. That's a Man Number Four. That's different. He is not One, Two and Three. He has in him the germs, in a feeling, of a potentiality of changing a feeling to an emotional state and including all forms of life—not only his own.

You're not clear about that, because it is both mental and emotional. And emotionally, you happen to wish for something that could grow up mentally. I talked last night about relationships, what it is for a man when he starts to Work, there is in him the potentiality of a bond, and there is in him the assurance that a man could also grow up. There is the potentiality which he feels, of a wish of honesty answering to life by means of his emotions. And for that, he knows he is cluttered up a great deal, and in that wish there is something, that he says, "But I need a guide. Where is the man, for me, in my life?" It has nothing to do with sex. It has to do with the negative and the positive quality of your life, but it has to do with the combination of two things, in which I become functioning. Sometimes it shifts. Sometimes the negative quality is the ordinary physical center, sometimes it is my feeling. But what I, in fantasy, wish is my King to be there as my mind, as Consciousness. That's what I want to grow up, because that ultimately will be the means of continuation, through this whole period of Self Consciousness, to become

Cosmic—if that is possible for one. Then I need my mind, and my mind has to be pure and purified—all the cobwebs of that machinery, little departments, has to be polished, and it should run, and it should be fed, and it should have energy, and it should have encouragement from that what is that quality of my emotions, looking up towards my brain, wishing my brain to become Conscious, wishing for my Conscience state to have, for me, guidance as life which then, in Consciousness, can take initiative, as a man will take initiative for a woman to satisfy her emotional state to the extent that he can. Not in any cold way. But to try to understand, to see what is needed for the creation of a world of an emotion for a man, because only that is the way, at the present time, that a man can have contact with God.

That's where we start. That's where the constant wish is important, to make the wish that, that it is the wish for Consciousness. But you must be clear that there is that kind of a wish for something that is also needed, so that you cannot go, simply, on a statement of the 'presence of something else' being there. It has no more meaning, unless that what is present to you is going to affect you. And then, of course, you will have to come to a definition of a certain kind if the presence is of a higher nature, that it belongs to God and the Lord visiting you and wanting to enter into your heart. You have to have attributes for that kind of a concept—not "vagueness," I say, of 'blue sky.' But you have to know, what is God, then? Benevolent? Of course. But strict; also, of course. He determines the laws of the Earth. He determines the laws of my own solar system. I wish Him to be my Consciousness. I want Him to be part of me. I wish to be part of Him. Because, on the basis of infinity it doesn't matter from which side you enter into the realm in which everything is forgotten and no form exists any longer.

Such things we talk about. We talked about attention. Attention of course must be there. How the hell can you ever think about Work without attention? It's attention of a

certain kind. It is attention that has not so much to do with the existence of myself living on this Earth; it requires attention: economic attention, political attention, sociological, all kinds of attention, attention with dexterity, to give my hands something to do, and do things well, and make things; of course it requires attention. But when I wish an 'I,' there is an attention of a certain kind, expressed by my wish of a higher kind, the wish to create that what can help me, and it needs attention—that is, energy. Attention is energy. I tell you, "do that what I would like to become real." I have a wish. I know that there is energy available of a different kind. I consider it. I listen to it once in a while. I say, "Is it right to use this energy for *that* purpose. Is there a possibility in which, when energies flow through me, there diverts some in one direction or another? How much is needed for the maintenance, how much can I actually afford to send in the direction of Consciousness, to make that more real?" That is the energy.

The attention that *I* pay to that is subjective. I have, in my mind and my feeling, this kind of a wish for wanting to grow. That is attention I must pay to that problem of progress, of growth for myself. When I want to grow up, I have to have within me that kind of a desire, which is still subjective but it is of a good kind because I have already eliminated a little bit of the nonsense of ordinary life and I sit in my inner chamber and I consider, "How can I present this kind of energy of a certain kind, even if it is as high as *I* can make it, how can it become acceptable to the Lord when I want to present it in the form of, this is what I wish to contribute to a formation of my 'I'? What can you do, God?"

I want God to match the quality of my energy. I want to put as much of my life into that what is a concept, and then I hope that it is acceptable to something that belongs to a different level of life, and that then it can be endowed by the wish of God, recognizing me as His child wanting freedom. And the recognition for such freedom, for me, means that

God accepts me. Then I can afford to wait, because then *my* attention is finished, and because of that I become open to receive something that I hope, then, that God in His Benevolence will want to give to me because I am striving, I am honest, I want definitely a way out, I am willing to find it. One says, sometimes, one "wishes to die." But, I must be there to die, first. Not vaguely. A sacrifice means: I take my sons and put them on an altar because God commanded, and I must go through that, until, until who knows what, what is needed for one.

Side 2 Of course, if one asks a question, and he asks for a blessing, and he asks for something that he can live with, that will not kill him, we always will, whenever we create anything of that kind like a little 'I,' you want it, to have it in your name. And you want to try to define it and describe it, and you cannot be blamed for using certain words for it which belong to the Earth, particularly when you want to answer questions which are quite earthly. But you have to have with it, in your voice, something, that it is nothing I know, the words I use are not right; I wished I could find a certain way by which such a word could be changed over and converted, the same way as I wish energy to be converted to be used for a definite purpose—which, for me, means I am perfectly willing to die in that kind of an effort.

Seriousness about Work. Seriousness in answering your questions. Whatever the question is that someone else asks you, whenever you try to enter into the sphere of the question, whenever you try to sit, sit in the presence of a group of people where you answer a tape, whenever it is that you try to visualize what has gone on and who said what, and always the acknowledgment of what has taken place. Because you are an outsider. You're not a one who comes in like a pope. You just listen, and you want to know what has gone on, and then maybe, from the outsider, you would like to become a little insider—a little bit too late because the tape and the meeting is already over and you are dependent on their

memory, so maybe you have to repeat what they may have forgotten. But then, when it is clear, of what *they* have said, what the question was, what can you, now, add in a certain way, perhaps more clear because you have a little bit more Objective viewpoint—but, always on the basis of wanting to become part; with them, and not above them.

You're not answering because you know so much more. You are answering because your experiences in life have given you an advantage, that sometimes it's possible for you to formulate in a certain way and, because of that, opening a door to someone who then perhaps can exclaim, "Ah, that, *that* is it; now I see." And don't hammer on it any further. Just let it be, let it simmer.

You know that Work is not cooking. That is, the process of bringing things to a quick boil does not enhance the value of the food. Whenever you have any kind of nourishment that has to be prepared, you have to allow quite a bit of time to let it simmer. Simmering is at a lower temperature than the boiling point. In the boiling point, many things are lost, because the boiling point means it is close to the phase of evaporation, and a great deal of material which is still quite substantial goes off into smoke—thin air, 'hot' air sometimes. Simmering is when you watch, and you don't let the guards [temperature for sterilization] go up too high, and when you put it in the oven, you don't allow it to rise above a certain temperature. It is just enough, at a certain temperature where the bad germs can be killed, because that's the way how we sterilize things. Not by excessive heat, but by a little continued heat, at a lower level, so that there is no mistake about it—as far as the germs are concerned, they are in a surrounding which is going to be sustained until they all die.

That is the meaning of simmering: to watch, to see what are characteristics, what are habits of mine which are the ways of your behavior, and gradually noticing them and becoming quite convinced that they actually exist, and that they are, and have the value that

you have to admit as truth. That is the simmering process. To change your subjectivity very slowly into Objective facts. One starts with a little section, in a very small way, but placing it immediately as something that is so exceptionally different from the rest that even in the presence of that little bit of potentiality, when you open the door to that department, you are already in awe, with such sadness to see that that subconsciousness has been pushed back, in the background, for whatever reasons your mind could give to you—but never wants to talk about it because the mind, as it is now, is so happy that it has crushed the potentialities of a spiritual life.

Try to remember these kind of things when you answer people, when you want to enter into their world, and when you want to become clear. And in particular when you think and talk to yourself: "And then I said to myself and then I answered, and then I said again, 'no,' and then I said again, 'but,' 'it,' and so forth, and then I looked at it again and I went around and I looked at it from a different angle, and then I saw that I have something that was forgotten, and I realized that I was not truthful enough."

These are the preparations that are needed for a person who wants to answer questions in a group. This is necessary, that it is aroused by the group and that then you take the questions, sometimes as an accusation and sometimes as a reminder for yourself, "How goddamned little do I know, what is it really that makes me sit here, once in a while thinking that I can help and at most I can talk and prattle a little bit about the different things that engage me and I know are worthwhile and I wish to communicate." But, how can I, being what I am—subjective, as I am, constantly so unconscious and so stinking, conceited sometimes—how can I become a different kind of a person, to be able, then, as a channel through which information can flow and then let it be as it is, and not give it the particular little kind of a twist that it leaves the channel so as to give it *your* imprint.

It is God who talks through you, every once in a while when you want to talk about

Work. It is Work that talks through you, and not your own manifestations and your associative values and all the different things which you call 'reconciliation,' and explanations over and over, one on top of the other, and correcting this as if you sit, as a pope, on a chair—and it turns out to be an electric chair, because it will be your death.

You know now a little bit how I would like to talk. How I would like you to talk. How I would like you to come next time, with the questions that you have formulated and the answers you have formulated and where you feel you might want a little bit, let's call it, 'clarification.' Clarification of the medicine. Not clarification of the doctor's brain. I want Work. I want psychological work of a certain kind. I don't want your representation of such Work. That's your affair. I want clarity of concepts. That is, you mix things and then you present it as medicine and you say, "Take one every hour, a little bit on the tongue like candy, so that it can dissolve." That's what we wish. What is the value of sulphuric acid? What can I do when it is a question of dissolving? Do I have to use aqua regia? [Aqua regia is 'royal water,' a caustic mixture of hydrochloric and nitric acids used in etching and by alchemists to dissolve gold.] Is it necessary to use strong language, or could it be a little softer, like a zephyr. Not always like a hurricane. Not always emphatic, in words, but sometimes to say the truth in a whisper: "By the way, don't forget, God is with you at the present time, everywhere and always—anytime, anywhere, any place, for all of us, without exception." Open your eyes if you want to Wake Up.

I say, such things one talks about with oneself. Bring your questions next week. If you want to, we continue with this—at this time, if you like. But I don't want to make it too long. Try to make it condensed. We covered a few things that you know about. Let's talk about things about which you're not clear as yet, and maybe—maybe—it can be of some help.

So, I'll see you later. Good bye.